

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action of November 2, 2009. With this amendment, claims 9 and 21 are amended, claims 14-17 are canceled and all pending claims 9-13 and 21-28 are presented for reconsideration and favorable action.

In the Office Action, claims 9-13 and 15-17 were rejected based upon Wilk (US 6,643,124) in view of Disanto (US 5,508,720). Claims 21-23 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based upon Wilk. Claim 24 was rejected based upon Wilk in view of Miyashita (US 6,327,482). It is believed that the amended claims are patentably distinct from these references.

The present invention relates to two screens being disposed adjacent to each other so that a large screen can be used, and additionally comprising a key input part for usage convenience.

First, as the Examiner mentioned, the Wilk and Disanto patents suggest a structure that the key input part slidably moves behind as the two screens are folded together, and that the key input part slides in a right-angle direction to a direction that the screens are connected.

However, the Wilk and Disanto patents do not provide a structure that the two screens are disposed adjacent to each other. On the contrary, the claimed invention relates to using the two screens as one screen. This is why the claimed invention includes the structure that the two screens abut each other.

That is to say, when the panel housing has four sides, the displays are more closely positioned on a sidewall of the panel housing to which the displays are adjacent, than the other sidewall of the panel housing. This is shown in Fig. 26 of the instant application).

Even though the Wilk and Disanto patents employ more than two screens and a key input, they absolutely do not suggest the structure of the two screens being adjacent to each other.

Further, the claimed invention further includes connection shafts used for folding and unfolding, which are located at both edges of the panel housing, and for the connection shafts,

connection shaft grooves (62a of Fig. 26) are equipped on the inner side of the sidewall of the panel housing.

However, the Wilk and Disanto patents do not suggest any structure whereby shafts are located on the inner side of the sidewall of the panel housing.

Further still, the Miyashita patent also does not suggest the structure of the shafts in accordance with the claimed invention, or a structure whereby displays are adjacent together. Miyashita only shows a display structure which is additionally comprised.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment, including the Office Action's characterizations of the art, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute the rejection claims in further prosecution of this or related applications.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance. Consideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: Judson K. Champlin/

Judson K. Champlin, Reg. No. 34,797
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3244
Phone: (612) 334-3222
Fax: (612) 334-3312

JKC:lrs